

But I should like to look with you at another side. The future of our world, if it has a future, lies with people who are basically unselfish, people who think of themselves infrequently and who, when confronted with a clear choice between self and others, often make the choice in favor of the others. People who hand out rewards and punishments in even-handed ways, treating individuals equally, not with less respect or smaller rewards because of their birth or breeding or skin color. People who have sympathy, in the strict sense of that word, with other people and attempt to participate in other feelings and thoughts. People who, at their best, are genuinely loving and feel a oneness with other human beings that most of us feel only with respect to members of our immediate families. People who are honest, not attempting to achieve their own ends by misleading others. People who are idealistic, setting standards and goals for themselves and for the world which may transcend realistic achievement but which can nevertheless fix the direction of a life. People who thrive on effort and hard work and sacrifice. The world has always moved ahead only because of the existence of such people. Are they dying out in the present generation? Certainly not. Certainly not.

Students at Wheaton, as in many other colleges, live under an honor system. They bind themselves to obey certain regulations and to see that those regulations are obeyed by others. It works remarkably well. I wonder how many of us can imagine such a system in the city halls or State houses of our respective homes.

These students show increasing concern for the state of society and the world in general, as indeed the current fund drive and other campus activities of the year show. They work long and hard at their academic work, and they add to their 45- or 50-hour-weeks charitable enterprises, pocket money jobs, and political and social interests.

They support one another. One of the most impressive aspects of college life is the degree to which young people in trouble can rely on their fellow students. Half the people who come into a dean's office are not there on their own behalf but are there to try to find a solution for the problems of a roommate or a friend. When a student is dismissed from college for violation of rules or for academic failure, it is routine for other students to volunteer to make personal sacrifices in order to give the dismissed student another chance.

They are honest. There is probably less hypocrisy in a group of college students than almost anywhere else. I sometimes think that what shocks their elders most is exactly their cheerful forthrightness in facing their own shortcomings and talking about them.

They are charitable. If the question of racial integration were left to the college students of this country, the problems would have long since disappeared. At their best they are sacrificial and brave. The young people who have entered Mississippi and Alabama to do the hard work of registering Negro voters and aiding in the education of the young have risked and occasionally lost their lives.

I have no hesitation in saying that today's college students have a basic moral standard and a basic understanding of what is worthy in life that is not only equal to those that we hold, or held at their age; it is superior.

Your daughters will tell you, if they have not already done so, that there are problems in their generation, as in every generation. They are not saints. Some have greater strength of character than others, and the temptations to human frailty placed before the young people of today are surely no less than they ever were. But by and large no one who spends day in and day out with Wheaton students can have any doubt that they are growing up to be bulwarks of

a moral society, to be mothers and voters and intellectual leaders of whom any society can be proud. But I am concerned with the constant criticism that they sometimes feel exposed to: criticism in the press and criticism at home. I contemplate with sadness the likelihood that when the schools and colleges turn these delightful young people out into the world, that world will gradually force them to become less honest, more hypocritical, less courageous, more selfish, less tolerant, more materialistic, and in general, smaller, narrower, less moral people. If you wish to live in a society where as many as possible of your neighbors come somewhere near to loving you as they love themselves, where as many as possible of your neighbors are genuinely concerned about the world and its future and are willing to make sacrifices for their own ideals, live for awhile, as you are living this weekend, in a college dormitory. But remember that there is no better way to destroy the genuine moral vision of our young people than to exaggerate the moral importance of their foibles or to let them believe that we consider their dress and their dating habits and their views about the Beatles of greater cosmic importance than dishonesty in government and business, poverty and despair in city tenements, police brutality in Selma, or the wanton destruction of lives in the Congo and in Vietnam.

It is surely one of the purposes of colleges like Wheaton to accentuate the positive and to build on the lively interest, the moral strength, and the emotional resilience of the young. I hope we can always have the joyful support of parents in this enterprise.

And if your daughters are full of health and promise, what about the college? What is the current state of Wheaton? It too comes in for its share of criticism some of it deserved, some not, some serious, some petty, most of it (like the criticism you direct at your daughters) constructive in purpose and friendly in tone. Like the girls, we have some of the pains and problems of growth and of establishing for ourselves a new and more significant role in society. Like the girls, we have chosen, I believe, a basically sound set of goals and need only to learn how to modify and adjust our approaches to those goals.

We have recently strengthened our faculty by additions to the departments of economics, government, sociology, and history. We have also enlarged the staff of classics, Spanish, German, Russian, and French. We will add another professor in art and one in philosophy next year. We have also substantially increased faculty salaries for another year and have undertaken to provide new quarters for the nursery school and for the department of psychology, the former in a new building and the latter by remodeling of the old gymnasium which will be freed when our impressive Clark Recreation Center is opened in a few weeks.

The curriculum continues under active and continuous review, as do calendars, grading procedures, and other aspects of our major task.

We shall have to undertake a major campaign for capital needs sometime in the next couple of years in order to provide badly needed scholarship funds, the long overdue science building (already designed and awaiting the necessary money) and various renovations and restorations of existing facilities, including an organ for this building which you will see in scale model in Watson Hall.

But we are on our way. We are happy about our general goals and achievements, and we intend to build for the future on the traditional Wheaton description of an excellent, small, residential, private, liberal arts college for women. Those adjectives are all

important to our plans and, we think, to the continued health of the college.

Let me close by saying that whatever satisfaction you may find in Wheaton this weekend should in part be credited to generations of our conscientious forebears, but most of what Wheaton is today and can become must be credited to your daughters. Don't ever underestimate their generation.

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. MORROW) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the Members' attention to the 26th anniversary of Slovak Independence Day.

Unfortunately, high-ranking officials in our Government, especially in the pre-World War II period and during the diplomatic negotiations with the Soviets in the latter days of the war, failed to understand the aspirations of the Slovak people for independence.

Consequently, the brave Slovak people, along with other nations behind the Iron Curtain, are now suffering under the dread oppression of communism. I certainly hope and pray that the Slovak people's courageous spirit and love of freedom will be maintained until the day when they regain their national independence. Surely they will be freed from Communist persecution and achieve their rightful place in the community of free nations.

I know that the religious heritage of Roman Catholicism, which the great majority of Slovaks hold dear, is a constant source of inner strength to them in resisting Communist philosophy.

NEW BILL WILL BAN FOREIGN SHIPS TRADING WITH CUBA AND NORTH VIETNAM FROM VISITING U.S. PORTS

(Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MORROW) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to prohibit transportation in commercial articles to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows its merchant marine to be used in trade with Communist Cuba or North Vietnam.

The United States has long had an embargo on trade with both Cuba and North Vietnam.

In addition in 1962 President Kennedy called for a voluntary boycott of Castro's Cuba by all freedom-loving nations. To some small degree this latter boycott has succeeded, but the United States has been reluctant to clamp down on the vessels of foreign nations that refused to comply with the boycott.

Now it is time to stop shipment of American cargoes in foreign vessels that are trading with Cuba and North Vietnam. In the last half of 1964 over 200 ships flying flags of our allies or of the free world transported Communist goods

to North Vietnam and these same ships are being permitted to compete with our American-flag vessels in visiting and doing business in our own U.S. ports.

As introduced, by bill would ban these free world vessels from using U.S. ports if they engage in shipping to or from Communist Cuban or Vietcong ports.

I am hopeful that immediate hearings will be held on my bill by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The time has long since passed when the United States should firm up its policy on trading with the enemy and in this connection we should exert pressure on other free world countries to stop strengthening the Communists in Cuba and Vietnam.

The number of my bill is H.R. 6301.

JAY G. HAYDEN

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the retirement of Jay G. Hayden, who for nearly 80 years has been a political writer in Washington for the Detroit News.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his last dispatch entitled "Signing Off." I think all of us who have known Jay and appreciated his outstanding services will be interested in his "last dispatch" which appeared in the Detroit News on February 26, 1965:

HAYDEN IN WASHINGTON: SIGNING OFF

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—In this, my last dispatch, to the Detroit News after more than 40 years as a Washington correspondent, it seems fitting to recall a few of the changes, particularly as affecting news reporting, over this long period.

Taking off from Detroit on Christmas Day, 1915, I boarded the Pennsylvania Railroad's Capitol Limited at 11 a.m. and arrived in Washington after breakfast the following morning.

Moving my family later, our model T Ford was loaded in a freight car along with the furniture and was 5 weeks in transit. The automobile, drained for fear of fire, was pushed out on the freight platform on arrival and treated to one quart of free gasoline to enable me to drive it away. I seem to recall that the price of gasoline at that time was about 10 cents a gallon.

There were advantages and disadvantages for newspaper reporters in those days. Helpful was the total absence of radio and television, leaving printed words all alone in the field of public information. Telephones were widely used locally, but had barely begun to develop over long distances. News transmission within the United States and overseas was almost exclusively by hand operated telegraph or by mail.

COMPETING WIRE

There was the advantage, however, that competition between two telegraph companies, Western Union and Postal, for newspaper trade was terrific. Their lines were numerously manned in the press galleries of Congress, at the White House, and wherever else news was breaking.

The most important single difference between 1916 and the present is the phenomenal growth of Federal Government, not only in personnel, physical establishment, and ex-

penditure, but in activities affecting the lives of all American people.

The whole cost of the Federal Government for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1916, was \$734,156,202. There was great commotion when for fiscal 1917 President Woodrow Wilson asked for and was granted appropriations slightly exceeding \$1 billion. Expenditures for fiscal 1917 actually leaped to \$1,977,681,751 due to the U.S. declaration of war against Germany, April 7, 1917. The peak annual expenditure during the World War I period, for fiscal 1919, however, was only \$16,514,870,958.

The latter figure has been exceeded in every year beginning with 1943 and climaxed by \$97,870,862,844 for fiscal 1964 under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

By all present signs Federal cost escalation is still going on, and so long as deficits continue to grow it is just as certain that the burden must fall back one day on the shoulders of American taxpayers.

EASIER TO SEE

News reporting was more fun in the earlier days due to much closer contacts with ruling officials. If memory serves, no pass was required for reporter admission to the White House until World War II, but that impediment has continued since, in war or peace.

For President Wilson's 8 years the Congressional Directory lists only three White House assistants—Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary, Thomas Brahaney, chief clerk, and Rudolph Forester, executive clerk—and that's actually all there were except women typists.

The comparable roll of White House aids to President Johnson published in January 1964, numbered 27 and certainly at salaries so high that they would have caused even President Wilson's Cabinet members to blush.

In Congress there is only one man left from the 1915-16 session and curiously his surname is the same as this writer. He is CARL HAYDEN, 87-year-old Senator from Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate, and chairman of its Committee on Appropriations.

Senator HAYDEN was first elected to the House in 1912, coincident with admission of his State to the Union, and continued to serve in that body until 1927 when he advanced to the Senate where he has remained ever since.

VOTING RIGHTS AND SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Congress was in the midst of much controversy over a proposed civil rights bill. After much debate during the long, hot summer, a bill finally emerged, thanks to the Members of both political parties who realized that discrimination had no place in the scope of full American life.

In that bill was a section on voting rights. I am sure the people of the Nation returned to their chores with the feeling that at long last every American would have an equal opportunity to register and vote, regardless of his race, color, or creed. Perhaps that is why the recent events in Selma, Ala., have come as a shock to the Nation, including the people of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, if the present law is so weak that it deprives any of our citizens of their treasured American right to vote,

or if the law has loopholes that prevent the Federal Government from enforcing voting rights, then the law must be changed. And it must be changed promptly. When a minority has waited so long for such a privilege, guaranteed to all Americans, he must not be forced to wait any longer. But this time, let us make sure we are giving him that right so that there is no further question on the subject and so that there is no further quess on either side.

And further, Mr. Speaker, before any of us condemn the community of Selma, we must realize that there, too, Americans live and work. All are not bitter racists, all are not club-swinging and tear-gas throwing police or troopers.

One thing seems clear. If Federal laws have been broken in Selma, Ala., no matter which side or person broke them, prompt action should be taken by the Federal Government. If no Federal laws have been violated, then we cannot demand Federal force simply because it appears to be humane. Violence cannot be condoned by any of us, but it cannot be suppressed without due cause, or by any agency other than one so authorized.

Let the Congress then proceed with diligence and determination to consider in proper course the legislation that has been recommended to us by the President.

REPEAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, Congress voted temporary increases in excise tax rates to help cover the cost of our country's participation in the Korean war. The increases were extended in 1954 and annually since then. Taxes on general telephone service and transportation, which had been imposed in 1941, were included in the annual extensions starting in 1959. The excise tax extensions have been one of many measures designed to finance the uncontrolled spending appetite of the big central government.

I firmly believe the selective excise tax is discriminatory and should be scrapped. The Congress has a moral obligation to the people to eliminate these temporary taxes which were imposed for a special purpose so long ago. I know that previous efforts to accomplish this reform in Congress have failed. But something must be done to alleviate the burden of these unfair taxes that hit hardest at the low income citizen who must pay the same tax rates as those with a greater ability to pay. One of the most unjust excise taxes is the 10 percent levy on communications.

Altogether, the Federal Government expects to take in about \$14.7 billion from excise taxes this fiscal year. Of this amount, telephone and telegraph users will pay one billion dollars to the Federal Government for the privilege of